

ECONOMIC COUNCIL LETTER

Published Semi-Monthly by

NATIONAL ECONOMIC COUNCIL, Inc.

350 Fifth Ave., New York 1, N. Y.

903 First National Bank Bldg., Utica 2, N. Y.

600 Investment Building, Washington 5, D. C.

1559 Continental Illinois Bank Bldg., Chicago 4, Ill.

Council Letter No. 153

October 15, 1946

Our Stupid Bi-Partisanship

WE observed several times in recent Council Letters—we particularly emphasized it in Letter 150—that since 1932 the national platforms and the candidate for President of the Democratic Party were definitely leftist; and that the platforms and candidates of the Republican Party were largely in agreement with the New Dealers. As a result, the people had no chance to express themselves—they had no clear-cut issues.

Apparently the same leftist influences that controlled the New Deal party were more or less successful in dictating platforms and candidates of the opposition.

We have hoped that in future the minority party would have enough vision, intelligence and guts to take such positions and to name candidates who would give the American people a choice between going Left or Right.

But in New York State, for example, little progress seems to have been made in accomplishing that end. The Republican candidate for United States Senator has made clear by his utterances that there is no issue between the parties on foreign affairs, labor relations or race relations. The *New York Herald Tribune* of September 24, 1946 quotes him as saying that in those fields "we have to be sure we're all going in the same direction."

In a radio address on October 2nd, this Republican candidate, Mr. Ives, said:

"So far as this nation is concerned, the keystone of that edifice (meaning lasting peace) is our bi-partisan foreign policy."

* * * * *

Let's see about this. When Germany and Japan surrendered, the United States was militarily, financially and morally the most powerful nation in the world. But since those great events of the Spring and Summer of 1945, the United States has lost out on nearly every diplomatic issue that has been raised. At Yalta, Potsdam and on other occasions it literally threw away all advantages it had gained.

Not only did it throw these away—it threw them into the hands of Soviet Russia, the only

country in the world capable, for an indefinite time to come, of making war on the United States.

In recent months Mr. Byrnes, profiting at last by his own tragic mistakes and those of Roosevelt, Hull and Truman, has adopted a firmer stand towards Soviet Russia. And, if plain words mean anything and if actions are to be taken for what they are (and not as our dreamers choose to interpret them), Soviet Russia has long been committed to the overthrow of the government of the United States by force, to the liquidation of all of her middle class citizens and to the setting up of one more Soviet Socialist Republic right here in the United States.

Much of this tragic loss of prestige—this throwing to the winds of the most vital American interests—has been due to the pursuing by the minority party in the United States of the perfectly insane idea that a so-called "bi-partisan foreign policy" has been wise statesmanship.

But it has not been wise statesmanship. It has merely accentuated the moral and political bankruptcy of the minority party. It has been a curse not only to this country but to the whole world. For it has meant that the policy of the majority party to appease Soviet Russia at every turn has been and has continued to be the policy of the minority party too. Small men, seeking votes for high office and lacking in both knowledge and principle, have cried out "Me-Too!" Leftist writers and commentators applauded—and, by default, this minority party has lost a great chance.

What misguided "liberals" fail to see is that a "bi-partisan foreign policy," far from being an advantage to the party and to the country, is the greatest possible disadvantage—because it removes some of the most vital issues from the field of debate.

No part of the English system of parliamentary government has been more successful than the institution known as the "Loyal Opposition." It has always been the task of the Loyal Opposition to scrutinize with the utmost care any and all policies, domestic or foreign, of "the Government." By cold-blooded analysis, by unhesitating and even scathing attack of the minority, the majority (whatever the party in power) were kept

on their toes. Therefore, the majority hesitated even to announce a policy until they themselves had subjected it to keen analysis. And then, at the hands of the Loyal Opposition, the policy was subjected to further and perhaps even keener analysis in Parliament itself.

In a London club, known as Brooks Club, of which Charles James Fox was a member, we have seen in the famous Bet Book records of many bets entered by Fox in his own handwriting against the success of a new fleet or a new army then just sailing for the Colonies where our Revolutionary War was in progress. For Fox, of course, was a member of the Loyal Opposition. He did not hesitate to speak out against the British attempt to coerce the American colonies. He spoke his mind as did others. Who knows but what this keen, aggressive questioning of British policy towards America in those days may not have been responsible for the British, after their final defeat at Yorktown, being willing to make a peace that proved very favorable to the American colonies.

Throughout the last two or three hundred years of British history, the Loyal Opposition has been one of the most potent factors in insuring what was, for Britain, a sound, healthy and vigorous policy. But our current fatuous American policy of "bi-partisan foreign policy" simply eliminates all chance of really intelligent debate on the floor of Congress—except, of course, by here and there a particularly vigorous and independent Congressman or Senator.

"Bi-partisan foreign policy" has meant the handing over of those eleven European countries to the murders and rapes, the tyrannies and liquidations, and all the other horrors practiced by Soviet Russia under Stalin. It has meant that no powerful voice has been raised at home against a foreign policy which was itself the product of activities of Soviet and British agents—each group of which did not fail to go as far as it could.

Of course, we distinguish between what a minority party can properly do in war and in peace. In war, once a policy is settled, it must be pursued, although as we have seen, Charles James Fox did not hesitate to question British policy in the middle of the American Revolution. But certainly in time of peace, the failure of the minority to question the foreign policy of the majority party is evidence of both incompetence and impotence.

If instead of the timid, time-serving "bi-partisan foreign policy" of recent years, we had had a vigorous and intelligent questioning by the minority of the communist-influenced foreign policy of the party in power, the disgraceful appeasements at Yalta and Potsdam might have been avoided. Certainly, there would not have been the almost unbroken series of ignominious diplomatic defeats, after 300,000 Americans had given their lives to achieve brilliant military victory.

And it is depressing and dismaying to find that a minority candidate for the Senate in the great State of New York has no more imagination than

to propose that his party shall not question this ill-fated "bi-partisan foreign policy." In other words, so far as he is concerned, there will be no Loyal Opposition to test any proposal affecting American foreign relations.

* * * * *

Mr. Ives says further, that there is no issue between Republicans and Democrats on labor relations.

Let's see what this means. The New Deal Party, working closely with radical organized labor leaders, first established and ever since has maintained the so-called Wagner Labor Relations Act. It has fought every one of several efforts to amend it. Twice within a few years the House passed amending bills, but the Administration's influence in the Senate prevented enactment. In 1946 the Case Bill, amending the Wagner Act, passed both Houses by large majorities, was vetoed by the President, and came within fifteen votes of being repassed by the necessary two-thirds majority in the Lower House.

Just about every assertion in the preamble to the Wagner Act is a plain unadulterated lie. This preamble sought to convey the idea it was in the interest of the working man. Under that law administered by communists and other partisans of radical unionism, wages have been forced up and production slowed down. Other "advantages," many of questionable value, have been obtained by mass action through the Wagner Act. The business of labor union organizing has prospered. But the price has been the surrender of their liberty by the workers. Some of the workers have, of course, been willing to surrender this. Millions have not. These latter have shown their resentment at the polls on many occasions—notably in the State of California in 1944, where, although 57% of all of the service men of the country voted for Roosevelt, yet California service men voted two to one against the closed shop.

Under the Wagner Act the Supreme Court has made some astonishing decisions; in particular, that of the then Justice Byrnes in the Teamsters' Case which held lawful the holding up by force of truckmen entering the City of New York and the exacting of sums of money from them for no services whatever—or beating them up if they refused to pay.

Under the Wagner Act and in conjunction with its cousins, the laws taking away from employers the right of injunction in labor disputes and exempting labor unions from prosecution under the anti-trust and anti-racketeering laws, the control of this country has been largely turned over to a small number of labor leaders, some of them aliens, some of them ex-criminals. The Wagner Act and the other acts cited have worked very little benefit to the workers. But they have put power greater than that of government in the hands of irresponsible men who have preyed upon not only the workers but the whole people.

These not-to-be questioned labor laws have given these reckless men the practical control of

this country. The City of Pittsburgh cowed and retreated under the demands of certain labor leaders. Communistic unions have absolute control today of all American shipping on all seas. The Transport Workers Union under Mike Quill has such power in New York City that even the city government dares not interfere.

Without the Wagner Act and these other laws enacted in each instance by politicians bidding for the "labor vote," Communism could make no headway in America. These laws have made for chaos, and Communism thrives on chaos. Even though some of the more conservative leaders in the A. F. of L. concede privately that these laws have brought evils to the country, not one of them would be safe if he dared raise his voice for repeal. And since of course the PAC insists upon retaining all of these things they call "Labor's gains," the Democratic Party in the State of New York and Mr. Lehman its candidate must fall in line.

Once in a while some official who has been intimately connected with the Administration speaks out his opposition. Last August Gerald D. Reilly, long a member of the National Labor Relations Board, pointed out on retiring that the Wagner Act and the procedures thereunder needed to be changed. He said in part:

"I think an employer should have the right to speak pretty freely to his employees about the long-term effect of unionization of his plants, co-relative to the right of the union to say anything it pleases."

It may surprise many to learn that the employer is not permitted to discuss unions, union matters or even to mention the word to his employees. But such is the case. The employer has been bound hand and foot, as it were, while imported labor organizers, some of them communists, have proceeded to reduce the employees to subjection, using whatever force and violence necessary. Thus hatred has been planted where good relations existed before.

Yet Mr. Ives sees nothing to discuss.

In recent months public opinion in America has mounted to a conviction that these laws must be repealed if we are to preserve our own freedom. Yet the minority party candidate for the United States Senate says *there is no issue in labor relations*. He acquiesces in all tyrannies that have been committed—or at least he does not want to discuss them. He is not moved by intimidation and violence practiced upon the worker, or upon his helpless wife at home. He is willing that the public shall walk, go hungry, become the victims of wage and price inflation at the hands of "Labor." Mass-picketing, amounting to insurrection, must not be challenged by government. For hope of a mess of votes, he is willing Communism in America continue to obtain whatever advantage it can by the retention of vicious laws. He goes even further than his party's candidate for the Senate two years ago, Mr. Thomas Curran, who himself wanted to speak against the Wagner Act

(his opponent being Wagner) but was prevented from doing so by the party organization. They were catering to "Labor."

Of no little interest is the further fact that the minority candidate for the Senate, by his acquiescence in New Deal labor policy, has made himself and his party valuable allies of communistic forces in the United States.

* * * * *

And this same Republican candidate for United States Senator says further, in substance, that there is no issue in regard to race relations.

Mr. Ives was the author of the so-called Anti-Discrimination Bill passed by the New York Legislature in 1945. It was jammed through the Legislature by the cooperating efforts of Governor Dewey and Mr. Ives, then majority leader of the New York Assembly.

We do not believe there has been much anti-race feeling in the United States in the past. But what there was was gradually disappearing—until in 1935 the Communist Party published its pamphlet entitled *The Negroes in a Soviet America*. This 47-page blueprint for revolution, written by two leading Communists, urged the Negroes in the South to rise in bloody revolt against the whites, form a Soviet Republic and affiliate with the Soviet Union. On Page 38, this pamphlet remarks:

"Any act of discrimination or of prejudice against the Negro will become a crime under the revolutionary law."

With this communist cue, Leftists in the United States cunningly began to cultivate in the minds of certain American intellectuals and do-gooders the idea that race prejudice was great and was growing, and that it could be stopped and eliminated only by the *compulsion* of the state.

Mr. Dewey interested himself in the idea, and from then on nothing could stop him and Mr. Ives from putting the law on the statute books. Multitudes of the more intelligent Negroes opposed the principle of the law, but they remained silent while their more superficial and vociferous brethren demanded its enactment.

It would be withholding the truth for us to fail to state that those working jointly with radical Negroes for the passage of the Anti-Discrimination Law (a first-cousin, of course, of the FEPC Bill which Congress has refused for several years to pass) were equally radical Jews. Rabbi Stephen S. Wise, who is hardly excelled by anybody for bitterness and venom, was one of the chief protagonists of the Anti-Discrimination Law. It is noteworthy that most of those Negroes and Jews who were so avid in their backing of the law were communistic or Communists, or consciously or unconsciously are playing the Communist game.

In no country on earth have both Negroes and Jews had a better chance than here. Yet a certain element of professional Jews is loud and vehement in its insistence that every last vestige of racial discrimination shall be swept away. In a recent

New York paper, a merchandising concern called Sachs & Company with several stores in New York, had an entire page devoted to this very contention.

As might be expected, the more the cry that anti-Semitism and anti-Negroism must be eliminated, the greater the tendency of these evils to grow. In fact, these radical Negroes and Jews are building up the very thing they say they are against. Which leads naturally to the remark that this agitation against racial discrimination is having the very effect the Communists intend it to have—namely, to stir up discord.

The Commission set up under the New York Anti-Discrimination Law has, it is true, begun with moderation. What pressures will sway it remain to be seen. But five Commissioners are drawing the quite satisfactory salaries of \$10,000 a year, and are laying the foundation for a substantial addition to New York State bureaucracy.

Enactment of this law was merely the addition of one more compulsion. It provides one more set of snoopers to intervene between employer and employee—between citizen and government. The assumption is that employers are naturally selfish, greedy, and filled with prejudice; while bureaucrats are lacking in all of these and in addition, being bureaucrats, have superior knowledge and wisdom, and higher ethics. Bureaucracy is usually based on that theory.

As a matter of fact, the Anti-Discrimination Law is itself a discrimination against white Gentile Americans, who, by reason of their very preponderance in numbers if in no other way, bore the brunt of the terrible war which the Administration contends is not yet over. Under this law, if a Negro or a Jew applies for a job and is not selected, he can claim he has been discriminated against because he is a Negro or a Jew. The judgment of the Commission is substituted for the judgment of the employer to whom, under the American system, this country looks for the successful carrying on of a business concern.

But if a white Gentile American is turned down, in all probability he will not raise the question that he was discriminated against because of his race. If he should raise the question, what chance would he have of winning?

The National Economic Council is opposed to any unfair discrimination *either for or against* any race. At the time the New York act was

pending we told the Ives Committee that if it desired to take any action, it should ask the Legislature to pass a simple joint resolution authorizing the Mayor of any city, if he believed race discrimination existed, to appoint a local committee which quietly, behind the scenes and without publicity, would attempt to eliminate the reason for it. But the Communistic element demanded a Law—they wanted to make political capital of it. They did not want adjustment and peace, but agitation. And against its own better judgment, the Legislature yielded.

This law, and the two or three which other states have modeled after it, are an attack against freedom in America. For these laws are one more instance of the introduction of Compulsion, which, of course, was the corner stone of Hitler Germany as it is of Stalin Russia.

So, Mr. Ives announces there is no issue between the candidates regarding race relations. We would hardly expect Mr. Lehman to object to the Anti-Discrimination Law and its implications and to a continuance of the policy of which it is a part, first because he is himself a Jew, and second because his party, through its affiliation with the PAC, is absolutely committed to just this line of first creating an issue—or at least raising it from unimportance to importance, and then assuming to deal with it—through the method of compulsion.

* * * * *

It would seem, therefore, that the voters of New York State, on two of the most important issues in the country and on a third which has been given undue importance, will have no chance this Fall to express their views. They can merely vote "Ja." To this extent the one-party system has been forced on them. Germany had that under Hitler.

So far as the senatorial election in New York State is concerned in the year 1946, both candidates are taking their cue, in these three respects, from elements that are completely alien to the tradition and the experience of the United States.

Merwin K. Hart

President

NATIONAL ECONOMIC COUNCIL, INC.